

REPORT NO

INFORMATION FROM
FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS CD NO.

COUNTRY Foreign

DATE OF
INFORMATION 14-16 February 1950

SUBJECT FOREIGN RADIO REACTIONS TO THE
NEW SINO-SOVIET TREATY AND AGREEMENTS, Nos. 1 and 2

HOW :
PUBLISHED Radio Broadcasts

DATE DIST. 27 February 1950

WHERE
PUBLISHED

NO. OF PAGES

DATE
PUBLISHED 14-16 February 1950

SUPPLEMENT TO
REPORT NO.

LANGUAGE Severin

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE
OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ESPIONAGE ACT 50
U. S. C., 31 AND 32, AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION
OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PRO-
HIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE FBID (This strictly factual report is based solely on monitored foreign radio broadcasts received in Washington up to 8 a.m., 16 February 1950. It reproduces two reports prepared in response to a special request.)

Number 1 (14-15 February)

INTRODUCTION: It is still too early for extensive foreign radio reactions to the new Sino-Soviet treaty and other agreements. To date, the news has been reported generally without comment. TASS has transmitted the texts of the treaty and of Chou En-lai's and Vishinsky's speeches at the signing ceremony; and the accompanying TASS announcement that the texts of the speeches have been broadcast in voice by Moscow suggests that the topic is slated for full exploitation by the Soviet radio. And a special Chinese Communist broadcast, introduced by the Chinese and Soviet national anthems, is devoted to the subject. The only expressed opinions appear in Japanese press service reports of a few brief statements by Japanese political leaders who, reacting negatively, cannot understand why the new treaty is directed against Japan.

VISHINSKY'S SPEECH: Vishinsky's speech at the signing ceremony is characterized by the usual platitudes about the Soviets' profound sympathy with and friendship for the Chinese people and their "heroic liberation struggle under the leadership of the leader of the Chinese people, Mao Tse-tung." Stalin is quoted to this effect. The agreements on the Chinese Changchun Railway, Port Arthur, and Dairen are said to "bespeak the high respect on the part of the Soviet Union for the national independence and national rights and interests of the Chinese people" and to demonstrate the "grandeur of the principles of Soviet foreign policy." And as with Soviet policy everywhere, the treaty and agreements "constitute the biggest contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and democracy throughout the world."

CHOU EN-LAI'S SPEECH: Chou's speech on the same occasion also contains the usual platitudes about friendship, unity, and cooperation; and both Stalin and Mao are praised, in that order. It does include a little more meat, however, than does Vishinsky's speech. Chou specifically charges that "the imperialist bloc, headed by American imperialism, resorted to all kinds of provocative methods attempting to frustrate friendship between our powers." He cites the economic and territorial agreements as bound to "evoke the greatest enthusiasm among the Chinese people." And in conclusion, he asserts that "the rallying of the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, counting approximately 700 million population, constitutes a force impossible to conquer."

CLASSIFICATION

~~RESTRICTED~~

[illegible]

RESTRICTED

- 2 -

Number 2 (15-16 February)

INTRODUCTION: Although there has been a considerable volume of foreign radio attention to the new Sino-Soviet treaty and agreements, there is as yet no comment available from countries other than Japan in the Pacific-Southeast Asia area. As expected, the Soviet and Chinese Communist radios have given major publicity to the news. Radio Moscow, in all languages used, has been broadcasting the texts of the treaty and agreements to the virtual exclusion of its normal commentaries. To date, however, it has issued only one commentary on the subject--a PRAVDA editorial paraphrasing the speeches by Vishinsky and Zhou at the signing ceremony and citing pertinent sections of the treaty and the supplementary agreements. Comments from radios in the Soviet sphere are, of course, all laudatory; they use a variety of specific arguments to enhance the prestige of the Soviet-Communist camp and to defame the U.S.-led "imperialist" camp. In Western-oriented comment there is a general refusal to accept the treaty and agreements at face value; but they are considered important as propaganda weapons.

SOVIET-COMMUNIST COMMENT: In addition to the usual generalized claims about the camp of "peace and democracy" and the benevolently righteous Soviet foreign policy, the following more specific points appear:

"Another substantial shift in the balance of power"--The camp of peace and democracy is repeatedly said to have been strengthened at the expense of the imperialist camp. Frequent references are made to the fact that the USSR and China together possess nearly one-third of the human race. A Berlin commentary says the pact marks the "merger of the vast territories of the USSR and China into one single geological area." And the same broadcast claims "that the prospect of preventing the outbreak of a third world war is no longer utopian."

Acheson unmasked--Listeners are reminded of Acheson's Press Club speech, which has allegedly been shown up as so much "false prattle."

Bulwark against U.S.-led imperialism--The "mutual military assistance which the pact provides" is said to be a "clear warning for all warmongers to heed." PRAVDA explains that the treaty singled out Japan because "American imperialism is doing all in its power to turn Japan into a strategic place d'armes directed against the USSR and China."

Implications for Asia--There are occasional suggestions that the treaty is "a new way in international relations, unknown to Asia previously. It aims at liberating Asiatic peoples and making them equal partners in the defense of progress and peace throughout the world." A NEW CHINA NEWS AGENCY editorial considers that the treaty "will have great effects on the situation in the East..."

No Titoism in China--Although there is no direct consideration of this issue, some indirect allusions are made to the subject. The NEW CHINA NEWS AGENCY, for example, contends that the treaty and agreements "will provide all patriotic, advanced elements and patriotic people with weapons to criticize effectively sentiments of narrow nationalism... entertained by some people." And a Warsaw broadcast concludes that the treaty "unites all hopes and calculations of the imperialists with regard to dissensions and divergences inside the camp of socialism, peace, and the liberation of colonial peoples."

Comparisons with U.S. aid agreements--The "magnanimous" Soviet aid to China is contrasted with ERP and MAP which imposed duties and burdens on the recipients of American aid. The one-percent interest on the Soviet loan to China is contrasted with the interest of three to three and a half percent charged by the U.S. Attention, however, is not drawn to the size of the Soviet loan.

RESTRICTED

RESTRICTED

~~RESTRICTED~~

25X1A2g

RESTRICTED

- 3 -

WESTERN-ORIENTED COMMENT: Practically all Western-oriented comments agree that probably there are secret clauses modifying the outward appearance of the announced treaty and agreements. (In this connection, only one radio in the Communist sphere--Radio Berlin--makes an explicit reference to the subject, claiming that there is "no room for any secret clauses such as were customary with the imperialist powers.") That the news represents a decided Soviet-Communist propaganda victory, however, is generally conceded. A French commentator contends that the treaty and agreements are "going to be powerful instruments of anti-colonialist propaganda" for both China and the USSR. (The clause promising non-interference in the internal affairs of either country is called an especially important victory for Mao.) There is also agreement that the treaty is directed primarily against the United States. And among those considering the subject, there is agreement that the possibility of Titoism in China has been minimized, if not written off completely.

Critical comments point to the limited amount of the Soviet loan and note the absence of treaty references to Sinkiang. They also predict that time and events will reveal the sacrifices to be wrung from China in return for the announced Soviet concessions; the relations between the Soviet Union and her European Satellites are pointed to as a precedent for what can be expected.

RESTRICTED

~~RESTRICTED~~